



Photo: NUST / Facebook

Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST) Vice-Chancellor Dr Eroid Naomab receiving the ESQR “Quality Achievement Award” in July 2022.

Money, resources wasted on vanity awards

The cases of public entities procuring such ‘awards’ makes a mockery of claims of belt-tightening, stricter financial controls and lack of money in government.

In what must surely rank as clear-cut examples of careless and wasteful spending of public funds at a time the Namibian government is going around telling everyone listening that it is cash-strapped, at least two public entities have spent sizable amounts of money on buying vanity awards over

the last year.

Numerous online sources define a vanity award as “an award in which the recipient purchases the award and/or marketing services to give the false appearance of a legitimate honour”. In other words, to be clear, it is a fake award or prize.

Vanity award scams are all about making money for those who run such scams.

One online article from 2015 warning businesses against such scams states “honourees who receive such emails,

letters and calls are not chosen by a select committee, as they are often told, but are plucked off mailing lists or have had their email addresses harvested from websites”.

The article goes to state that: “Many of these vanity award schemes involve [organisations] receiving awards not based on merit, but rather for the sole intent of purchasing the plaque or certificate for an inflated price.”

And it states of the modus operandi of such scammers: “One telltale sign of a vanity award is that you receive an unexpected email or letter saying you or your [organisation] has just won an award, even though you never entered anything and you’ve never heard of the organisation bestowing the award.”

To be clear from the outset, if a private entity or company pays for a vanity award then the loss of money in such a scam is borne by the owners of that entity or company. However, when a public entity, that is funded by the government from taxpayer money, buys a vanity award then the loss falls to the public in lost resources that could have translated into better service delivery.

There are a number of vanity award peddlers out trying to entice Namibian entities to buy their ‘awards’, with one such scam standing out recently.

NUST’s ESQR ‘award’

On 7 July 2022 a post was published on all the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST) social media pages, proclaiming that the state-funded university had been ‘awarded’ a “Quality Achievement Award by the European Society for Quality Research (ESQR)”.

The post states that Dr Eroid Naomab, NUST Vice-Chancellor, had received the ‘award’ on behalf of the university at a ceremony in Barcelona, Spain.

The post includes a photo of Dr Naomab accepting a certificate and a trophy from a man that *Procurement Tracker Namibia* and its sister project, *Namibia Fact Check*, are yet to accurately identify.

The tuxedo-ed individual in the photo with Naomab appears in many photos on the European Society for Quality Research (ESQR) website and other ‘awards’ images online.

ESQR appears on a list of “trophy-for-sale organisations” on a Wikipedia page dedicated to vanity awards.

An investigation, titled ‘[What price honor?](#)’, published in October 2014 by the international investigative journalism initiative, the Organised Crime and Corruption Reporting Project (OCCRP), identified ESQR as one of the western Europe based entities that were targeting eastern European and other developing country public and private entities for their ‘prizes’ and ‘awards’.

The OCCRP report states: “The pattern appears to be that anyone who pays enough money can win an award. Many winners come from the public sector, which means that money paid for awards came from budgets or ultimately from the pockets of taxpayers. These awards do not come cheap.”

The cost of ‘winning’ these “meaningless international awards” is labelled a “participation fee” by the likes of ESQR, which they say goes towards hosting a glitzy awards ceremony, usually in an expensive and culturally-renowned European city.

Procurement Tracker Namibia sent an information request to the NUST Vice-Chancellor’s office requesting information on how much was paid for the ESQR ‘Quality Achievement Award’, as well as how much was spent on flights, accommo-

dation and daily subsistence in order for Dr Naomab to attend the ESQR award ceremony in Barcelona, Spain.

However, despite acknowledging receiving the information request and stating in response that *Procurement Tracker Namibia* should “please be assured that we will respond as soon as possible”, and despite a follow-up, the NUST Vice-Chancellor’s office had still not responded by the time of going to print with this edition.



Photo: NUST / Facebook

The Facebook post that announced that NUST had been ‘awarded’ a “Quality Achievement Award” from July 2022.

Questions sent to NUST VC Dr Eroid Naomab’s office on 18 August 2022:

- The European Society for Quality Research (ESQR) has been identified as one of a number of “trophy-for-sale organisations” targeting especially developing country officials and academics for their ‘awards’, meaning that entities that receive their ‘awards’ actually buy these ‘awards’. How much did NUST pay for the ESQR “Quality Achievement Award”?
- Furthermore, various NUST social media posts indicate that you received the ESQR ‘award’ at a ceremony in Barcelona, Spain. How much did NUST pay in flight, accommodation and daily subsistence costs for your trip to Barcelona, Spain?

Participation fee

We do have some idea of how much NUST paid for the ESQR “Quality Achievement Award”, for the university was not the only Namibian state-owned entity that fell for this particular vanity award scam in recent times.

In mid-December 2021 it was reported by various Namibian media outlets that the Namibia Investment Promotion and Development Board (NIPDB) had received the same ESQR “Quality Achievement Award” at a ceremony in Dubai, United Arab Emirates (UAE), on 11 December 2021.

In response to a similar information request to the one sent to NUST in August 2022 the NIPDB responded as follows: “In November 2021, the Namibia Investment Promotion and Development Board (NIPDB) was contacted by the European Society for Quality Research (ESQR) with the news that the Board has been selected as winner of the ESQR Quality Achievement Award. Being a relatively new organisation at the time and unfamiliar with these awards and the awarding body, the Board requested for more information from the organisers specifically pertaining to the selection process and criteria used to determine the winners.”

It has to be borne in mind that at the time ESQR had contacted the NIPDB with the news of the ‘award’, the NIPDB was effectively in operation for less than a year.

In their response (see **NIPDB response to Procurement Tracker Namibia questions**), the NIPDB also indicated that they had paid Euros 4,100 as a “participation fee”, in order for NIPDB chief executive officer Nangula Uaandja to accept the ‘award’ at a ceremony in Dubai.

On the day, 11 December 2022, that Uaandja received the ‘award’, Euros 4,100 was equal to just over N\$74,000, underscoring the OCCRP statement that these “awards do not come cheap”.

NIPDB response to Procurement Tracker Namibia questions

1. The European Society for Quality Research (ESQR) has been identified as one of a number of “trophy-for-sale organisations” targeting especially developing country officials and academics for their ‘awards’, meaning that entities that receive their ‘awards’ actually buy these ‘awards’. How much did NIPDB pay for the ESQR “Quality Achievement Award”?

As a public entity, ethical conduct and professional integrity are an integral part of the governing ethos of the NIPDB. Therefore, in the course of delivering its statutory mandate, the Board places great emphasis on conducting business with organisations that not only reflect the shared values of responsible professional conduct but are also ethically sound. It is for this reason that it was important for the Board to fully understand the criteria used to select the winning organisations before resolving to accept the award.

In essence, the NIPDB did not pay for the ESQR Quality Achievement Award. The funds that were dispersed in the process of receiving the award were participation fees that were required from all participants. According to the ESQR, the participation fees (Euro 4100) cover attendance of the Convention during which the award ceremony was held, reproduction rights and use of promotional materials for marketing purposes, accommodation and tickets to the gala dinner amongst others.

2. Furthermore, various media reports indicate that you received the ESQR ‘award’ at a ceremony in Dubai, UAE. How much did NIPDB pay in flight, accommodation and daily subsistence costs for your trip to Dubai, UAE?

The award ceremony was held in Dubai at the same time as the Expo 2020 Dubai. Therefore the award was collected on the Board’s behalf by two staff members who were already stationed in Dubai and managing the Namibian pavilion at the expo. As such no further costs were incurred in this regard.

Based on this, if NUST had paid the same “participation fee”, on 7 July 2022, when the post of the NUST ‘award’ appeared on social media, the Euros 4,100 was equivalent to about N\$70,000. However, factor in air travel, accommodation and daily subsistence, and NUST potentially spent somewhere between N\$150,000 – N\$200,000 in order for Dr Naomab to collect the ESQR “Quality Achievement Award” in Spain.

Paying this much towards receiving what is effectively a fake ‘award’ needs to be seen in the context of a public institution that is constantly complaining about being under-funded and under-resourced by the government.

Considering all this, Namibian public officials and public entities need to be reminded, [as stated in an online article](#) warning about vanity award scams, that “if you are legitimately getting an award for something, you’re not going to be asked to foot the bill. Let’s be clear here”.

The case of the PMR ‘awards’

Namibian companies and public institutions have over the years made a public show of ‘winning’ PMR Golden Arrow Awards.

Namibian public entities, such as the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST) and the City of Windhoek, among many others, have ‘won’ numerous PMR Golden Arrow Awards over the years.

However, [an online article from 2005](#) cautions: “Take the PMR Golden Arrow Awards for example. Now these are probably the most criticised of all corporate awards, yet one will find their framed awards certificates gracing the reception areas of some of the biggest corporations in the country. A lot of big companies pay big, big money for a PMR award.”

It needs saying that if you are paying for an ‘award’ then you have not earned it on merit, and it is thus not a real award.

Role for the Procurement Policy Unit?

The Procurement Policy Unit (PPU) is mandated to monitor, investigate and report on what happens in and across the public procurement system.

The issue of public entities procuring vanity awards is one that should be seen in the light of wasteful expenditure on things that do not contribute to improving the quality of service delivery in and by the public service or public institutions, such as the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST) and the Namibia Investment Promotion and Development Board (NIPDB).

While the amounts are relatively small, in the context of overall budgets, such clearly inappropriate and unnecessary spending on frivolous matters of all sorts by public entities probably do add up to considerable sums of money wasted on an annual basis.

This seems to be an obvious area on the public procurement landscape to investigate.

Update on the green hydrogen procurement transparency issue

Ten months later and transparency remains questionable in the wake of the procuring of a preferred bidder for the green hydrogen project.

In *Procurement Tracker Namibia* 16, which came out at the start of April 2022, we questioned the lack of transparency following the awarding of preferred bidder status to Hyphen Hydrogen Energy in the “largest tender in the nation’s history”, as described by President Hage Geingob in November 2021.

We questioned this lack of transparency because the Public Procurement Regulations of 2017, of the Public Procurement Act of 2015, are clear about what is supposed to happen when a successful bidder is announced.

The regulations, in section 39 (1), state that once an award has happened – Hyphen Hydrogen Energy was announced as preferred bidder on 2 November 2021 at COP 26 – the procuring public entity should publish a notice of award and the executive summary of the bid evaluation report on its website and in nationally distributed print media within seven work days of the award.

At the time of writing this, such a notice of award and executive summary of the bid evaluation report had still not been published online or been made public in the prescribed manner by the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT) or through the green hydrogen website (www.gh2namibia.com) connected to the Namibia Investment Promotion and Development Board (NIPDB) in the Office of the President.

Before publishing *Procurement Tracker Namibia* 16, we had sent questions regarding this lack of transparency and other matters relating to awarding Hyphen Hydrogen Energy preferred bidder status to presidential economic adviser and green hydrogen commissioner James Mnyupe, among others, but had not received a response by publication time.

Mnyupe response

Following the publication of the last *Procurement Tracker Namibia*, James Mnyupe did respond, both in the media and directly to *Procurement Tracker Namibia*.

However, that response was not an official response as the note sent, via WhatsApp by Mnyupe to *Procurement Tracker Namibia* lead researcher Frederico Links, was not on an official letterhead and did not contain a signature, date, official stamp or reference number, as all official government correspondence does.

To be clear, in its information request *Procurement Tracker Namibia* had asked why the request for proposals (RFP) method was used and when the notice to award and the summary of the bid evaluation report would be made public.

That said, Mnyupe did make statements in his direct communication and to the media that could be considered mis-

leading, especially regarding the question of the use of the RFP method.

To [quote from a 6 April 2022 article](#) in *The Namibian* that referred to Mnyupe’s response: “Mnyupe said the RFP was under the ministry of environment and was exempted from the Public Procurement Act, “where the underlying regulations that could govern concessions for example are absent or being drafted””

In his response note James Mnyupe stated: “With regards to the non-adherence to the Procurement Act, The Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land (the Policy) states that “The Tender Board has concurred that MINISTRY is not required to follow the Tender Board procedures when tendering concessions under its jurisdiction. It is of the opinion that the authority to issue concessions in such areas rests with the Minister. However, the MINISTRY must ensure that the awarding of concessions is competitive, fair and transparent and ensure that safeguards against favouritism, improper practices, fraud, theft and corruption are in place and followed.”

This was a reference to the old Tender Board which ceased to exist with the implementation of the Public Procurement Act since 1 April 2017.

At the time he made these statements *Procurement Tracker Namibia* was in possession of the RFP document, which clearly indicated that the procurement of a bidder for a concession on protected state-land to be issued by the MEFT was governed by and conducted under the Public Procurement Act of 2015.

Paragraph 9 of the RFP document stated: “In all processes where a procurement process is conducted, the Namibian Government is required to follow an open and competitive procurement process and to observe the objects of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 to help it identify a suitable Bidder.”

And in paragraph 26 the document states: “The procurement process will be conducted in accordance with the relevant objects and provisions of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act No. 15 of 2015); any other relevant laws of the Republic of Namibia and in terms of this RFP”

Following Mnyupe’s confusing response, *Procurement Tracker Namibia* resent the information request to green hydrogen commissioner James Mnyupe, not regarding the unsigned and unattributable note received via WhatsApp as official correspondence and a sufficient response to the questions posed.

However, to date an official response has still not been forthcoming, more than six months after the initial request was sent and resent.

It has to be noted that more information about the procurement process has come to light in recent months with the publication of a document titled ‘Traction – Namibia’s Green Hydrogen Overview’ on the green hydrogen website (www.gh2namibia.com).



Simplified version of:

Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act, No. 15 of 2015)

Public Procurement Regulations

[eprocurement client system](#)

Public Procurement Guidelines with frequently asked Questions and Answers

Public Procurement Guidelines on annual procurement plans.

What's become of the plans?

In the previous financial year it finally looked as if the situation was improving, even if slightly, but for 2022/23 transparency has gotten worse.

Six months into the 2022/23 government financial year and there is very little transparency to be had about what is supposed to be happening in terms of public procurement.

This is because the annual procurement plans of most public entities are still not easily accessible to the public.

To be clear, once again, according to section 8(1)(d) of the Public Procurement Act of 2015, a public entity has to produce an annual procurement plan, which, according to section 1.5 of the Public Procurement Guidelines, should be submitted to the Procurement Policy Unit (PPU) and posted or published on the website of a public entity.

Over recent financial years compliance with these regulations and guidelines has increased and improved, as reported in previous editions of *Procurement Tracker Namibia* and the combined annual report of the PPU – that was tabled in parliament in October 2021 – but it appears 2022/23 is showing a concerning regression in transparency.

Where are the plans?

Over recent years the PPU used to publish all annual procurement plans submitted to it in a DropBox folder linked to its webpage on the Ministry of Finance website.

However, this practice seems to have been stopped as for the current financial year there are no annual procurement plans available in the DropBox folder.

Instead, earlier in year, in an online meeting with the management of the PPU, it was indicated to *Procurement Tracker Namibia* that all annual procurement plans submitted to the PPU would in future be published on the 'new' eProcurement Portal, which now basically serves as the website of the PPU.

The eProcurement Portal appears to have been created in 2020, but seems to not have been used or even been live until earlier this year. How aware the general public is of this website is questionable. *Procurement Tracker Namibia* was certainly not aware of the website until the meeting with the PPU staff, when its existence came up during discussion.

As for the extent of availability of procurement plans through the eProcurement Portal, for the current financial year, only 11

1.5. ANNUAL PROCUREMENT PLAN

1.5.1. Each Public Entity should file its annual procurement plan with the Procurement Policy Unit (Policy Unit). Throughout the year, the Public Entity should give the Policy Unit notice of changes in the annual procurement plan. Further, quarterly reports detailing the progress of implementing the procurement plan should be filed. These reports are due to the Policy Unit by the end of the month following the end of the quarter. The Public Entity should post its procurement plan on its website.

annual procurement plans of public entities were viewable or accessible through the website by early September 2022.

That's a strikingly low number at the halfway point of the financial year, and given the fact that there are roughly 190 public entities (minus a few, such as Air Namibia, that have folded or been shuttered over the last two years or so) subject to the public procurement law.

The accessible annual procurement plans thus represent about six percent (6%) of annual procurement plans.

Some of the procurement plans accessible through the eProcurement Portal are not available on the websites of the public entities they refer to – case in point, while the finance ministry's annual procurement plan is viewable through the eProcurement Portal, it is not available to view on the ministry's website.

Change is coming (maybe?)

The recently passed Public Procurement Amendment Act of 2022 is supposed to rectify this situation by stipulating, in section 25(4), that an "accounting officer must – (a) engage in procurement planning, plan each step of the procurement process and prepare an annual procurement plan, and must submit the plan to the Policy Unit at least three months before the commencement of each financial year;"

In other words, by the end of December 2023 (the amended procurement law is only expected to be implemented as from the 2023/24 financial year), all public entities should have finalised and submitted annual procurement plans to the PPU for the 2024/25 financial year.

Strict enforcement of this deadline by the PPU will of course determine to what extent compliance is achieved.

In this regard, the amended procurement law states: "(4A) An accounting officer who fails to submit the annual procurement plan on time may be held liable for non-compliance in terms of section 7(4)(a)."

Public procurement in the UNCAC review process

Namibia's public procurement system is under scrutiny in terms of compliance with Article 9 of the global anti-corruption instrument

A review team, accompanied by officials from the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), visited Namibia in late August 2022 to assess the country's compliance with the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC).

The review team was drawn from France and Uganda and conducted consultations with Namibian government, business and civil society actors from 23 – 25 August. The aim of the consultations was to interrogate and finalise the draft country review report on implementation of specific sections of UNCAC. The draft report had been finalised

and submitted for review by Namibian authorities in July 2022, judging by the date on the document.

Namibia is currently undergoing assessment of its compliance with chapters two (II) and five (V) of UNCAC.

Against this backdrop, Article 9 of chapter two of the convention deals with "Public procurement and management of public finances", and Article 9 (1) deals specifically with public procurement.

This article looks at what Article 9 (1) says, what the Namibian government stated in the draft report in terms of its compliance with the article, and what the UNCAC review team's responses and queries have been in relation to the Namibian government statements.



Draft Country Review Report of Namibia

Review by *Uganda and France* of the implementation by *Namibia*
of articles 5-14 and 51-59 of the United Nations Convention
against Corruption for the review cycle 2016-2021

A final report on Namibia's compliance under the assessed articles should be published and released publicly, whether in part or whole, before the end of 2022. *Procurement Tracker Namibia* will keep you updated once such a report is available.

What UNCAC's Article 9 says about public procurement

Article 9 Public procurement and management of public finances

1. Each State Party shall, in accordance with the fundamental principles of its legal system, take the necessary steps to establish appropriate systems of procurement, based on transparency, competition and objective criteria in decision-making, that are effective, inter alia, in preventing corruption. Such systems, which may take into account appropriate threshold values in their application, shall address, inter alia:

(a) The public distribution of information relating to procurement procedures and contracts, including information on invitations to tender and relevant or pertinent information on the award of contracts, allowing potential tenderers sufficient time to prepare and submit their tenders;

(b) The establishment, in advance, of conditions for participation, including selection and award criteria and tendering rules, and their publication;

(c) The use of objective and predetermined criteria for public procurement decisions, in order to facilitate the subsequent verification of the correct application of the rules or procedures;

(d) An effective system of domestic review, including an effective system of appeal, to ensure legal recourse and remedies in the event that the rules or procedures established pursuant to this paragraph are not followed;

(e) Where appropriate, measures to regulate matters regarding personnel responsible for procurement, such as declaration of interest in particular public procurements, screening procedures and training requirements.

Namibian government's responses to UNCAC compliance question

To the question of whether Namibia complies with Article 9, the response from the Namibian government is "Yes".

This answer is backed up by the following statements:

"As a means to improve Namibia's procurement system, the Government of Namibia enacted the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act. No.15 of 2015), repealing the Tender Board Act, 1996 (Act No. of 2016). The objective of the Act is to promote principles of fairness, transparency and ensure that public procurement is non-discriminatory among other key principles. The Procurement Act, 2015 is anchored on the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) model law on procurement, which provides a model law on public procurement that sets international standards in respect of public procurement.

The Procurement Policy Unit, established pursuant to section 7(1) (e) of the Public Procurement Act 2015, is mandated to carry out, monitor, and report on the performance of the public procurement systems in Namibia, including awareness creation, capacitation and training of public servants, bidders and other stakeholders in the public procurement process."

Furthermore, the government lists the following in support of its answer:

- Public Procurement Act, No. 15 of 2015
- Public Procurement Regulations, 2017
- Public Procurement Guidelines (issued pursuant to section 7(1) (h) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015)
- Guidance Note on Public Procurement

UNCAC reviewers' observations in response to Namibian government answers

The following observations by reviewers were recorded in response to the Namibian government's answers to the compliance question:

"Does the Procurement Policy Unit have an oversight role? Could Namibia clarify a bit the various bodies that are involved in the procurement processes and their exact roles (Minister, Board, recruitment committee, procurement committee etc.)? That would help in better understanding Namibia's system related to public procurement.

According to the 2017 Public Procurement Regulations, the open bidding procedure seems to be mandatory if the amount of the procurement exceeds certain thresholds as detailed in Annex 1 of the regulations. Could Namibia confirm this understanding? But the text does not specify expressly that the open bidding procedure is the default procedure. Could Namibia provide more information about this?

Could Namibia also specify whether there is an existing prohibition to provide too specific details in the invitation to bid? What happens if the public entity wants to modify an invitation for bidding? Is there a process in place to inform all relevant persons and is there a maximum deadline for this?

Could Namibia provide information about the review and the possibility to request for a judicial review without being conditioned to the administrative one?

Could Namibia also provide more information about the contract management part? The law does not seem to cover this part of the procurement process. Some provisions are indeed included in the 2017 Regulations (sections 40 and 41) but it would be helpful if Namibia provides more information about it. In particular, could Namibia provide more details about the conditions for price adjustments?

Finally, has Namibia adopted an e-procurement system?"

The UNCAC review asked: “Please describe (cite and summarise) the measures/steps your country has taken, if any, (or is planning to take, together with the related appropriate time frame) to ensure full compliance with this provision of the Convention?”

UNCAC article	GRN compliance response
<p>Art. 9 (1) (a)</p> <p>(a) The public distribution of information relating to procurement procedures and contracts, including information on invitations to tender and relevant or pertinent information on the award of contracts, allowing potential tenderers sufficient time to prepare and submit their tenders;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Choice of Procurement Methods – Section 27 of the Public Procurement Act. Deadline for submission of bids – Section 47 of the Public Procurement Act. Minimum period for submission of bids – Section 35 of the Public Procurement Regulations.
<p>Art. 9 (1) (b)</p> <p>(b) The establishment, in advance, of conditions for participation, including selection and award criteria and tendering rules, and their publication;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibition of disqualified bidders and suppliers from participation – Section 50 of the Public Procurement Act. <p>“In addition to the above, there are standard bidding documents used by public entities where evaluation criteria (technical evaluation criteria) are set out depending on tender specifications of each procurement activity.”</p>
<p>Art. 9 (1) (c)</p> <p>(c) The use of objective and predetermined criteria for public procurement decisions, in order to facilitate the subsequent verification of the correct application of the rules or procedures;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examination and evaluation of bids – Section 52 (9) of the Public Procurement Act. <p>“This means that a bidder whose price is the cheapest will not necessarily be awarded the contract but the bidder who has scored both on technical aspects and price shall be awarded the contract.”</p>
<p>Art. 9 (1) (d)</p> <p>(d) An effective system of domestic review, including an effective system of appeal, to ensure legal recourse and remedies in the event that the rules or procedures established pursuant to this paragraph are not followed;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Panel – Sections 58 to 60 of the Public Procurement Act.
<p>Art. 9 (1) (e)</p> <p>(e) Where appropriate, measures to regulate matters regarding personnel responsible for procurement, such as declaration of interest in particular public procurements, screening procedures and training requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct of staff members of public entities – Section 66 of the Public Procurement Act. Disclosure of interest – Section 76 of the Act. Public Procurement Guidelines – Issued pursuant to section 7(1)(h) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015. Guidance Note on Public Procurement – The Guidance Note serves as a procurement manual.